

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA

Jacques Pierre, #305613,	)	C/A No. 3:08-4025-CMC-JRM
	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
	)	Report and Recommendation
vs.	)	
	)	
John E. Ozmint; James Simons Jr.; M. Carolina Lindsey,	)	
	)	
Defendant.	)	
	)	

The plaintiff, Jaques Pierre, (“Plaintiff), proceeding *pro se*, brings this action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. Plaintiff is incarcerated at Evans Correctional Institution in Marlboro County, SC, and files this action *in forma pauperis* under 28 U.S.C. § 1915. Plaintiff claims that defendant correctional institution violated his rights when its employees failed to satisfactorily respond to grievances. The Complaint should be dismissed for failure to state a claim upon which relief may be granted.

*Pro Se and In Forma Pauperis Review*

Under established local procedure in this judicial district, a careful review has been made of the *pro se* Complaint herein pursuant to the procedural provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 1915. This review has been conducted in light of the following precedents: *Neitzke v. Williams*, 490 U.S. 319, 324-25 (1989); *Estelle v. Gamble*, 429 U.S. 97 (1976); *Haines v. Kerner*, 404 U.S. 519 (1972); and *Gordon v. Leeke*, 574 F.2d 1147 (4<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1978).

The Complaint *sub judice* has been filed pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915, which permits an indigent litigant to commence an action in federal court without paying the administrative costs of proceeding with the lawsuit. To protect against possible abuses of this privilege, the statute allows a district court to dismiss the case upon a finding that the action “fails to state a claim on which

relief may be granted” or is “frivolous or malicious.” § 1915(e)(2)(B)(i), (ii). A finding of frivolity can be made where the complaint “lacks an arguable basis either in law or in fact.” *Denton v. Hernandez*, 504 U.S. 25, 31 (1992). Hence, under § 1915(e)(2)(B), a claim based on a meritless legal theory may be dismissed *sua sponte*. *Neitzke v. Williams*, 490 U.S. 319 (1989); *Allison v. Kyle*, 66 F.3d 71 (5<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1995).

The court may dismiss a claim as “factually frivolous” under § 1915(e) if the facts alleged are clearly baseless. *Denton*, 504 U.S. at 31. In making this determination, the court is not bound to accept without question the truth of the plaintiff’s allegations, but rather need only weigh the plaintiff’s factual allegations in his favor. *Id.*

This Court is required to liberally construe *pro se* documents, *Estelle v. Gamble*, 429 U.S. 97 (1976), holding them to a less stringent standard than those drafted by attorneys, *Hughes v. Rowe*, 449 U.S. 9 (1980) (*per curiam*). Even under this less stringent standard, however, the *pro se* Complaint is subject to summary dismissal. The mandated liberal construction afforded to *pro se* pleadings means that if a court can reasonably read the pleadings to state a valid claim on which the plaintiff could prevail, it should do so, but a district court may not rewrite a petition to include claims that were never presented, *Barnett v. Hargett*, 174 F.3d 1128, 1133 (10<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1999), or construct the plaintiff’s legal arguments for him, *Small v. Endicott*, 998 F.2d 411, 417-18 (7<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1993), or “conjure up questions never squarely presented” to the court, *Beaudett v. City of Hampton*, 775 F.2d 1274, 1278 (4<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1985).

### Discussion

Plaintiff complains that his grievances did not receive timely, satisfactory responses from staff at the institution where he is incarcerated. The grievances, as explained in the Complaint and attached prison grievance forms, relate to Plaintiff’s “max-out” date, which has been extended as

Plaintiff has lost good time credits. However, Plaintiff mentions the substance of the grievances only in passing. Complaint at 3. The gravamen of the Complaint instead involves the grievance process itself, and the delay he allegedly suffered due to actions of the Defendants. Plaintiff asks the Court to award him \$75,000.00 in damages against each Defendant.

The Complaint is filed pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983, which “‘is not itself a source of substantive rights,’ but merely provides ‘a method for vindicating federal rights elsewhere conferred.’” *Albright v. Oliver*, 510 U.S. 266, 271 (1994), quoting *Baker v. McCollan*, 443 U.S. 137, 144, n. 3 (1979). A legal action under § 1983 allows “a party who has been deprived of a federal right under the color of state law to seek relief.” *City of Monterey v. Del Monte Dunes at Monterey, Ltd.*, 526 U.S. 687, 707 (1999). To state a claim under § 1983, a plaintiff must allege two essential elements: (1) that a right secured by the Constitution or laws of the United States was violated, and (2) that the alleged violation was committed by a person acting under the color of state law. *West v. Atkins*, 487 U.S. 42, 48 (1988); *Gomez v. Toledo*, 446 U.S. 635, 640; *American Mfr. Mut. Ins. Co. v. Sullivan*, 526 U.S. 40, 49-50; *See also Hall v. Quillen*, 631 f.2d 1154, 1155-1156 (4<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1980).

While Plaintiff is suing Defendants who are arguably state actors, he has not met the first prong of the test. Plaintiff has alleged no facts suggesting the violations of a right secured by the Constitution or federal law. Plaintiff’s primary allegation is that his grievances regarding prison conditions have not been acted upon as speedily as he would like. However, access to the grievance procedure, whether speedy or not, is not a constitutionally protected right, and therefore Plaintiff’s claim must fail. *See Adams v. Rice*, 40 F.3d 72, 75 (4th Cir.1994).

#### Recommendation

Accordingly, it is recommended that the District Court dismiss the Complaint in the above-

captioned case *without prejudice* and without issuance and service of process. *See United Mine Workers v. Gibbs*, 383 U.S. 715 (1966); *see also Neitzke v. Williams*, 490 U.S. 319, 324-25 (1989); *Haines v. Kerner*, 404 U.S. 519 (1972). Plaintiff's attention is directed to the important notice on the next page.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'J. McCrorey', with a stylized, looping flourish extending from the end.

Joseph R. McCrorey  
United States Magistrate

January 9 , 2009  
Columbia, South Carolina

### **Notice of Right to File Objections to Report and Recommendation**

The parties are advised that they may file specific written objections to this Report and Recommendation with the District Court Judge. Objections must specifically identify the portions of the Report and Recommendation to which objections are made and the basis for such objections. In the absence of a timely filed objection, a district court need not conduct a de novo review, but instead must “only satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face of the record in order to accept the recommendation.” *Diamond v. Colonial Life & Acc. Ins. Co.*, 416 F.3d 310 (4<sup>th</sup> Cir. 2005).

Specific written objections must be filed within ten (10) days of the date of service of this Report and Recommendation. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b). The time calculation of this ten-day period excludes weekends and holidays and provides for an additional three (3) days for filing by mail. Fed. R. Civ. P. 6(a) & (e). Filing by mail pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 5 may be accomplished by mailing objections to:

Larry W. Propes, Clerk  
United States District Court  
901 Richland Street  
Columbia, South Carolina 29201

**Failure to timely file specific written objections to this Report and Recommendation will result in waiver of the right to appeal from a judgment of the District Court based upon such Recommendation.** 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); *Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140 (1985); *United States v. Schronce*, 727 F.2d 91 (4th Cir. 1984); *Wright v. Collins*, 766 F.2d 841 (4th Cir. 1985).